



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,053	07/12/2005	Yukihiro Yanagawa	274562US0PCT	6381

22850 7590 03/24/2006

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

LAVILLA, MICHAEL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1775

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/542,053	Applicant(s) YANAGAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael La Villa	Art Unit 1775	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20050712</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The spacing of the lines of the specification is such as to make reading difficult.
New application papers with lines 1½ or double spaced on good quality paper are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
3. The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Regarding Claims 1 and 2, it is unclear what is the relationship between the “electroconductive metal,” “electroformed layer,” “electroconductive film,” “aluminum” and “oxygen.” Is the metal of the first mentioning of “electroconductive metal” necessarily the same or different from the metal of the second mentioning of “electroconductive metal”? Is the first mentioned metal to be aluminum? The claim says that the “electroconductive film” is “formed on a front face thereof.” What comprises the material of the mold? Is this the “electroformed layer”? Is it something else? It is unclear how the “front face thereof” is to comprise a film of “electroconductive metal,” yet the “electroconductive film” has “the front face” “substantially formed” of aluminum or aluminum and oxygen. What is the relationship between “the front face thereof,”

“a back face of the electroconductive film,” “the electroconductive film having the front face,” “the back face formed of an electroconductive metal,” “the front face toward the back face”? Are more than one front and/or back faces being described? Is the “electroformed layer” possibly something other than “electroconductive metal” and aluminum? Can the electroformed layer and electroconductive metal be aluminum?

6. Regarding Claims 3 and 5, it is unclear whether the claimed compounding ratio is an average ratio or a specification of the limits of relative amounts that must be found in the film.
7. Regarding Claim 7, it is unclear whether the decrease is to occur to a depth of 110 angstroms or starting at a depth of 110 angstroms. Is “rate” the same as “ratio”? It is unclear what is meant by “monotonically.” Is this a linear decrease, a variation that is always a decrement, or something else?
8. Regarding Claim 9, it is unclear what is the antecedent basis of the phrase “the electroconductive metal.” Which reference to “electroconductive metal” is being further specified?
9. Regarding Claim 11, it is unclear whether the aluminum evaporation step results in all fitted aluminum being left, or not necessarily. Is the non-evaporated fitted aluminum to be removed or not contributed to the formed article? It is unclear whether the “electroconductive metal” can be “aluminum.”
10. Regarding Claim 12, it is unclear whether the claimed ratio refers to the weight ratio of materials to be deposited or to weight ratio of materials deposited and

Art Unit: 1775

forming a film. If the latter, it is unclear whether the ratio is an average or range that must be obtained.

11. Regarding Claim 14, it is unclear whether Claim 14 ends at line 2 with the word "nickel."

12. Regarding Claim 15, it is unclear what is meant by the phrase "metal to be electroformed." An electroformed layer is formed. Is this what is being described?

COMMENT

13. Since the meaning of these claims cannot be ascertained, no prior art rejections are applied. Depending on applicant's arguments and/or amendments, prior art rejections may be warranted over the cited prior art or other references.

Conclusion


14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael La Villa whose telephone number is (571) 272-1539. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer McNeil can be reached on (571) 272-1540. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1775

16. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael La Villa
20 March 2006


MICHAEL E. LAVILLA PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER